

**REMARKS**

The present amendment is intended to place the application in condition for allowance and permit issuance of a patent directed to the subject matter of the claims that were indicated as allowable, i.e., of claims 8 and 17. The amendment of claims herein and in previous amendments is not an admission regarding their patentability and is without prejudice to presentation of their subject matter in continuing applications.

In the April 20, 2004 office action, the examiner indicated that then-pending dependent claims 8 and 17 contained allowable subject matter because they were directed to an interference absorption circuit which detects interference components in a signal and removes them during a time interval which may depend on and be equal to the interference component duration wherein the detection or removal module may be disabled if the repetition rate of the interference components is too high. In the amendment filed on June 28, 2004, the independent claims (1, 10, 11, and 12) were amended to include a delay means or a delay step, and such elements were deleted from dependent claims 9 and 18. In the September 30, 2004 office action, the examiner rejected the independent claims, concluding that the delay limitations did not impart patentability. The examiner repeated verbatim the statement of reasons for allowable subject matter.

The foregoing amendment removes the delay limitations previously added to the independent claims, and restores them to dependent claims 9 and 18. It also adds to the independent claims the subject matter that made claims 8 and 17 allowable. Claim 1 has also been amended to specify the interference detection means and interference removal means referenced in claim 8, and dependent claim 3 has been amended to reflect that these elements have been specified in claim 1. Accordingly, the claims are now directed to allowable subject matter.

The April 20, 2004 office action contained an objection to the specification for lack of section headings, which applicant traversed. It is not clear whether that objection was continued in the September 30, 2004 office action, since box 9 is not checked on the office action summary. It is respectfully pointed out that 37 C.F.R. § 1.77 makes no requirement for section headings; it merely says they "should" be included. The only required section heading the undersigned is aware of is that in 37 C.F.R. § 1.72(b), requiring a heading for the abstract, and the application contains such a heading. It is respectfully submitted that the specification complies with all requirements of the patent statutes and rules.

It is respectfully submitted that the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and further examination is requested, and a notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven R. Petersen, Reg. No. 31,287  
Attorney  
(914) 333-9640

Dated: December 29, 2004